

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20-59, and 66-70 are pending in the application.

In this Supplemental Amendment, claims 1, 18, 21-30, 32, 36, 42-51, 53, 54, 66, and 67 have been amended for purposes of clarity and without any narrowing of scope.

Claims 18, 21-30, 32, 36, 42-51, 53, 54, and 67 have been amended to change the symbols, for purposes of clarity and without any difference in meaning.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove “of an experiment” and “of said experiment.”

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity in the outputting step (d) to replace a semicolon with a colon. Claim 30 has been amended for clarity in the outputting step (e) to replace a semicolon with a colon. Claim 66 also has been amended for clarity in the outputting step to replace a semicolon with a colon.

No new matter has been added by these amendments. Entry of the foregoing amendments and consideration of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks Examiner Larry Riggs and Examiner Joe Shubo Zhou for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on March 19, 2008 (hereinafter “Interview”), with Applicant’s representatives Eileen Sun, Adriane M. Antler, and Stephanie X. Wang. During the Interview, Examiners Riggs and Zhou suggested that Applicant amend claims 30-59 for clarification to provide new symbols to represent the processed profiles (*e.g.*, processed experiment profiles or processed reference profiles) by putting a “P” before the “A_m” or “C_m.” Dr. Antler also suggested to Examiners Riggs and Zhou that new symbols be used to similarly clarify claims 21-29, to which Examiners Riggs and Zhou agreed. Examiners Riggs and Zhou also suggested that the semicolon following the word “displaying” in the outputting steps of claims 1, 30 and 66 be replaced by a colon, for purposes of clarity. In addition, Examiners Riggs and Zhou brought up the issue of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in view of a policy change in the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), contending that outputting to a computer readable storage medium would no longer be deemed to satisfy § 101, since a “computer readable medium” could include a “carrier wave.” Dr. Antler responded that the term “computer readable medium” should be construed in view of its usage in the specification, which makes it clear that the specification does not

contemplate a carrier wave as a computer readable medium. Rather, Dr. Antler submitted that when reasonably construing the term in light of its usage in the specification, one would consider a "computer readable storage medium" to be a tangible, physical storage object such as exemplified by a hard drive, one or more floppy disks, one or more CD-ROMs, one or more DVDs or one or more DATs, as described at page 58, line 29 through, page 59, line 1 of the specification. The Examiners stated that they would think about the § 101 issue. The Examiners also agreed that it would be acceptable to delete "of an experiment" and "of said experiment" from claim 1. The Examiners stated that a Supplemental Amendment incorporating the amendments discussed should be filed at the latest by April 13-19, 2008 to ensure its consideration.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendments and remarks into the file of the above-identified application. Applicant believes that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Date: April 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Adriane M. Antler

32,605

(Reg. No.)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939